



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/724,975	11/28/2000	Raymond C. Pang	X-805-6 US	7824

24309 7590 02/16/2005

XILINX, INC
ATTN: LEGAL DEPARTMENT
2100 LOGIC DR
SAN JOSE, CA 95124

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, MINH DIEU T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2137

DATE MAILED: 02/16/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p align="center">09/724,975</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p align="center">PANG ET AL.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p align="center">Minh Dieu Nguyen</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p align="center">2137</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 21 September 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is FINAL. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 2-16 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1 and 9-16 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-8 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 3-6 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☒ Claim(s) 9-16 are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>9/21/04</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. This action is in response to the communication dated September 21, 2004 with the cancellation of claim 1, the amendment of claim 2 and the addition of claims 4-16.

Claims 1-16 are pending.

Response to Arguments

2. Applicant's arguments, see page 9, filed September 21, 2004, with respect to the rejection(s) of claim(s) 2 under Trimberger (6,654,889 and 6,480,954) have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made in view of Kean (2001/0015919).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

3. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

4. Claims 2 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

The phrase "disabling the PLD ..." is misleading, technically the PLDs can not be disabled, only all or some of the designed logic functions in configuration bitstream are prohibited to implement.

Election/Restrictions

5. Newly submitted claims 9-16 directed to an invention that is independent or distinct from the invention originally claimed for the following reasons:

- a) Claims 2-8, drawn to protecting a design for configuring a PLD, classified in class 713, subclass 194.
- b) Claims 9-16, drawn to method for configuring a PLD, classified in class 713, subclass 189.

The inventions are distinct, each from the other because of the following reasons:

7. Inventions a and b are related as combination and subcombination. Inventions in this relationship are distinct if it can be shown that (1) the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed for patentability, and (2) that the subcombination has utility by itself or in other combinations (MPEP § 806.05(c)). In the instant case, the combination as claimed does not require the particulars of the subcombination as claimed because group a does not require storing plurality of decryption keys and storing configuration data in configuration memory of the PLD. The subcombination has separate utility such as configuring a PLD wherein the PLD can be protected differently than the method of group a.

7. Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

8. Since applicant has received an action on the merits for the originally presented invention, this invention has been constructively elected by original presentation for

Art Unit: 2137

prosecution on the merits. Accordingly, claims 9-25 are withdrawn from consideration as being directed to a non-elected invention. See 37 CFR 1.142(b) and MPEP § 821.03.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

10. Claims 2 and 7-8, are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Kean (2001/0015919).

a) As to claims 2 and 8, as best understood, Kean discloses a method and apparatus for secure configuration of a field programmable gate array comprising loading an encrypted bitstream representing the design into the PLD (Fig. 5); decrypting the bitstream in the PLD to produce an unencrypted bitstream representing the design; configuring the PLD with the unencrypted bitstream (page 2, paragraph [0011]).

Kean does not explicitly disclose disabling the PLD from being partially reconfigured.

However, Kean discloses a field programmable gate array which supports partial reconfiguration may be programmed by a sequence of bitstream fragments, each bitstream fragments can be loaded and verified independently and would have its own

Art Unit: 2137

cryptographic checksum (page 10, paragraph [0135]). Kean also discloses each encrypted bittream will have a different initial value applied so this does not compromise security (page 10, paragraph [0136]). This concept of preventing attack would be implemented to disallow partial reconfiguration once configuration with decryption is started.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to employ the use of disabling PLD from being partially reconfigured as disclosed in Kean so as to protect proprietary configuration data for PLDs.

b) As to claim 7, Kean discloses the configuration bitstream includes encrypted configuration data and encrypted configuration memory addresses (Fig. 5, page 2, paragraph [0023]).

Allowable Subject Matter

11. Claims 3-6 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Minh Dieu Nguyen whose telephone number is 571-272-3873. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F 6:00-2:30.

Art Unit: 2137

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Andrew Caldwell can be reached on 571-272-3868. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 872-9306.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 571-272-2100.

Minh Dieu Nguyen
Examiner
Art Unit 2137

mdn
2/14/05

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Andrew Caldwell". The signature is fluid and cursive, with a large, stylized "A" and "C".

ANDREW CALDWELL
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER